



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,187	06/04/2001	Von L. Hansen	10004440-1	5615

7590 02/03/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MARIAM, DANIEL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2621

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/874,187

Applicant(s)

HANSEN, VON L.

Examiner

DANIEL G MARIAM

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Office Action mailed on June 8, 2004 applicants have submitted a response filed on September 3, 2004 arguing to traverse the rejection of pending claim 1-14.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicants' arguments, see pages 6-7 of the remarks, filed September 3, 2004, with regard to the Johnson, et al. reference have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 102 rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9, 11 and 13 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicants' arguments regarding Tanaka, see pages 7-8 of the remarks, filed on September 3, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 6 and 11 under 35 USC 102 are persuasive, and the rejection is withdrawn. Please note, the prior art may be applied against the above-identified claims under 35 USC 103.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 6-7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Medina (5,889,897).

With regard to claim 6, a computer system for processing scanned data (See Figure 1), the computer system comprising: a processor (item 14, in Fig. 1); a memory, coupled to the processor, storing instructions, i.e., program, that are execute by the processor (item 14 & 18, in

Art Unit: 2621

Figure 1) to perform a method of processing the scanned data (item 12, in Figure 1), the method comprising: identifying characters within the scanned data (See col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 6); comparing the characters to templates of each style, i.e., font, characteristic to determine style characteristics for each character (See for example, col. 3, lines 6-31); and saving in the memory the scanned data as processed data containing the style characteristics of the scanned data (col. 3, lines 31-52).

Claim 1 is rejected the same as claim 6 except claim 1 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 6 is equally applicable to claim 1.

With regard to claim 7, the computer system of claim 6, further comprising a Scanner (See item 12, in Fig. 1) coupled to the processor (item 14, in Fig. 1) and adapted to provide the scanned data (As shown in Figure 1).

Claim 11 is rejected the same as claim 6. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 6 is equally applicable to claim 11. As to a machine-readable medium for use in a computer system having a processor for processing scanned data, the medium having instructions that are executed by the processor to perform a method of processing the scanned data (See items 14 & 18, in Fig.1; and item 114, in Fig. 4).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2621

7. Claims 2, 5, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medina (5,889,897) in view of Huang (6,496,600).

With regard to claim 8, Medina discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above in paragraph 5, and incorporated herein by reference. Medina does not explicitly call for preparing an information sheet containing the style characteristics of the scanned data and printing the information sheet. However, Huang (See for example, Figs. 1 & 2 & "item S5111", in Fig. 5) teaches this feature. Medina and Huang are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e., character recognition and font identification (See for example, the Abstract). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Huang with Medina. The motivation for doing so is if for no other reason than to organize an information page/s containing various font types, and to transfer this page to an output, such as a printer, for printing the page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huang with Medina to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

With regard to claim 10, while the font comparison in Medina is generic, Medina however, does not expressly call for wherein the comparison of the characters to a style library containing templates is performed in the style characteristic order of font size, font, and font style. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to replace the font comparison described in Medina such that segments of the font can be arranged in the manner recited in this claim, so as to make comparison of characters based on the their feature arrangement, since no new or unexpected results are seen to be attained by ordering the parameters as recited in this claim, and the font per se can be used to compare the characters without the claimed ordering of the components.

Claim 2 is rejected the same as claim 8 except claim 2 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 8 is equally applicable to claim 2.

Claim 5 is rejected the same as claim 10 except claim 5 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 10 is equally applicable to claim 5.

Claim 12 is rejected the same as claim 8. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 8 is equally applicable to claim 12.

Claim 14 is rejected the same as claim 10. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 10 is equally applicable to claim 14.

8. Claims 3-4, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medina (5,889,897) in view of Johnson, et al. (5,237,627).

With regard to claim 3, Medina discloses all of the claimed subject matter as presented above in paragraph 5, and incorporated herein by reference. Medina does not expressly call for setting the style characteristics in a format such that the processed data containing the style characteristics is readable by a word processing program. However, Johnson, et al (See col. 4, lines 6-10; and col. 7, lines 61-68) teaches this feature. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching as taught by Johnson, et al into the system of Medina and to do so would at least permit the reading and editing of the various font data using a word processing program.

With regard to claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the comparison of the characters to a style library includes templates for font size, font, font style, effects, or paragraph structure (See col. 4, lines 13-21 of Johnson, et al; and col. 3, lines 37-40 of Medina).

Claim 9 is rejected the same as claim 3 except claim 9 is an apparatus claim. Thus,

Art Unit: 2621

argument analogous to that presented above for claim 3 is equally applicable to claim 9.

Claim 13 is rejected the same as claim 9. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 9 is equally applicable to claim 13.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent Numbers: 4850026, 5367618, 6182099, and 6741745.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL G MARIAM whose telephone number is 703-305-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30) FIRST FRIDAY OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LEO BOUDREAU can be reached on 703-305-4607. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**DANIEL MARIAM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

January 13, 2005